

# Warwickshire Pension Fund Risk Policy



**WARWICKSHIRE**  
PENSION FUND

**RP2025.1**

March 2025

## **Introduction**

This is the Risk Management Policy for the Warwickshire Pension Fund ("the Fund"), part of the Local Government Pension Scheme ("LGPS") managed and administered by Warwickshire County Council ("the Administering Authority").

Risk management is central to the management of the Pension Fund, as reflected by the coverage of risk in key documents such as the Funding Strategy Statement and the Investment Strategy Statement. It is an essential element of good governance in the LGPS. The Fund will aim to comply with the CIPFA Managing Risk publication and the Pensions Act and Pensions Regulator's Code of Practice as they relate to managing risk.

The Risk Management Policy details the risk management strategy for the Fund, including the following key areas:

- The Fund's attitudes to, and appetite for, risk;
- Aims;
- Risk measurement and management; and
- Responsibility.

### **The Fund's attitudes to, and appetite for, risk**

The Administering Authority recognises that effective risk management is an essential element of good governance in the LGPS. By identifying and managing risks through an effective policy and risk management strategy, the Administering Authority can:

- demonstrate best practice in governance;
- improve financial management of the Fund;
- better manage change programmes and projects;
- minimise the risk and effect of adverse conditions on the Fund;
- identify and maximise opportunities that might arise;
- minimise threats; and
- support innovation and continual improvement in a changing environment.

The Administering Authority adopts best practice risk management, which supports a structured and focused approach to managing risks and ensures risk management is an integral part in the governance of the Fund, at a strategic and operational level.

The Administering Authority recognises that it is not possible or even desirable to eliminate all risks. Some risks can be mitigated by putting in place a simple control process whereas other risks will remain at a high level, despite any mitigating controls being put in place. Accepting and actively managing risk is therefore a key part of the risk management strategy for the Fund. A key determinant in selecting the action to be taken in relation to any risk will be its potential impact on the Fund's objectives, considering the Administering Authority's risk appetite, particularly in relation to investment matters. Equally important is striking a balance between the cost of risk control actions against the possible effect of the risk occurring.

In managing risk, the Administering Authority will:

- ensure that there is a proper balance between risk taking and the opportunities to be gained;
- adopt a system that will enable the Fund to anticipate and respond positively to emerging risks; and
- minimise loss and damage to the Fund and to other stakeholders who are dependent on the benefits and services provided.

The main strategic risk to the Fund is failing to meet its primary objective of having sufficient funds to meet its liabilities when they become due for payment. This particular risk is managed through the Funding Strategy, which models the likelihood of a range of possible outcomes occurring and the way in which the contribution rate strategy and the investment strategy combine to deliver those outcomes (the method used by the Fund's Actuary is sometimes referred to as stochastic modelling, but there are others). It also relies upon the strong covenant of the major employing bodies in the Fund which allows for a long-term perspective to be taken.

The Administering Authority also recognises that risk management is not an end in itself; nor will it remove risk from the Fund or the Administering Authority. However, it is a sound management technique that is an essential part of the Administering Authority's stewardship of the Fund. The benefits of a sound risk management approach include better decision-making, improved performance and delivery of services, more effective use of resources and the protection of reputation.

## **Aims**

In relation to understanding and monitoring risk, the Administering Authority aims to:

- raise awareness of the need for risk management by all those connected with the management and administration of the Fund (including Officers, Pensions Committee Members and the Local Pensions Board);
- integrate risk management into the culture and day-to-day activities of the Fund;
- anticipate and respond positively to change and emerging risks;
- minimise the probability of negative outcomes for the Fund and its stakeholders;
- identify control and review sources of assurance already in place to mitigate against risk and highlight areas requiring improvement; and
- establish and maintain a robust framework and procedures for identification, analysis, assessment and management of risk.

## **Risk measurement and management**

### **Identifying Risks**

Risks to the Fund are identified in a number of ways:

- Monitoring performance against the Fund's Annual Business Plan;
- Recommendation and findings of auditors and other professional advisors;
- Feedback from Local Pensions Board, employers and other stakeholders;
- Meetings of senior officers and staff involved in the management of the Fund; and
- Meetings with other organisations, regional and national associations, and professional groups.

Risks are regularly reported to the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee and Local Pension Board as part of routine quarterly reporting. There is a separate Risk Register, which has been developed to categorise risk across a number of areas. These include but are not limited to

- Funding
- Administration
- Governance
- Investment

The Pension Fund has a set of high-level objectives which cover all key aspects of the Fund under each of these areas. The greatest risks to the Fund are therefore those associated with not meeting the high-level objectives. The risk register details the risks associated with not achieving the Fund's objectives. This ensures a comprehensive coverage of all areas of the Fund.

Each of the risks has been given an impact score and a likelihood score before any controls are applied. These have then been combined to give an overall pre-control risk score, which has been assigned a **Red – Amber - Green (RAG) rating**.

The Impact and Likelihood risk scores are evaluated using the criteria explained in the [Warwickshire County Council Strategic Risk Framework](#).

Likelihood is defined as the probability of the risk occurring. The assessment of this score uses the following assessment criteria:

Score	Description	Probability of Occurrence	Likelihood of Occurrence
1	Highly Unlikely	The event may occur in only rare circumstances (remote chance)	1 in 8 + years
2	Unlikely	The event may occur in certain circumstances (unlikely chance)	1 in 4-7 years
3	Possible	The event may occur (realistic chance)	1 in 2-3 years
4	Probable	The event will probably occur (significant chance)	1 in 1-2 years
5	Very Likely	The event is expected to occur or occurs regularly	Up to 1 in every year

Impact is defined as the consequence on the Fund and its objectives should the risk occur.

The assessment criteria for the Impact score has been extended to include Warwickshire Pension Fund specific criteria:

Score	Description	Members and Employers	Investments and Funding	Administration
1	Insignificant	<p>Negligible impact - not noticeable by members or employers, no complaints or issues likely to be raised by members or employers.</p> <p>Example - Member or employer communication newsletter issued a few days later than planned.</p>	<p>Negligible impact - of a level that would not register for investment action.</p> <p>Example - Normal volatility levels being experienced in the investment portfolio.</p>	<p>Negligible impact - low level administrative issues resolved internally with no impact on key performance indicators</p> <p>Example - A manageable backlog of data to be uploaded to the administration system that has no impact on actual member payments.</p>

Score	Description	Members and Employers	Investments and Funding	Administration
2	Minor	<p>Minor impact on members and/or employers which may cause correspondence about issues that can be resolved at source.</p> <p>Example - A member not being given the correct information first time when corresponding with the Fund and this having to be corrected, but having no impact on benefits paid</p>	<p>Minor impact on investment operations requiring monitoring and attention but not requiring anything other than business as usual actions.</p> <p>Example - minor adverse fund investment event, such as a credit default within a private credit portfolio which is of a business-as-usual nature.</p>	<p>Minor impact on administration performance requiring action within business-as-usual parameters.</p> <p>Example - an employer experiencing persist difficulty in providing correct data resulting in the need for extra training/support/correspondence to resolve</p>

Score	Description	Members and Employers	Investments and Funding	Administration
3	Moderate	<p>Material adverse impact on members or employers that is of cause for concern to them and the Fund and requires escalation for non-business as usual resolutions</p> <p>More likely to be isolated issues but could have some scale.</p>	<p>Material impact requiring bespoke corrective action, but manageable within the existing Investment Strategy</p> <p>Examples - Significant drift or step change in actual in asset allocation taking the Fund risk profile out of tolerances, or significant slippage in the implementation of</p>	<p>Material impact on administration performance, but manageable within approved policies and procedures.</p> <p>Examples - Inability to agree a transfer of membership and liabilities from another fund, requiring arbitration by a third party, or disappointing data quality scores resulting in a need for an improvement plan.</p>

		Example - Inability to finalise and sign off an admission agreement with a new employer resulting in escalation.	a significant Fund transfer	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Score	Description	Members and Employers	Investments and Funding	Administration
4	Major	<p>Significant adverse impact on members or employers that result in a direct impact on benefits paid or contributions due or member or employer satisfaction with Fund performance. Likely to result in complaints.</p> <p>More likely to be systemic issues.</p>	<p>Major impact requiring significant corrective action and a change in Investment Strategy or Funding Strategy, or the significant sale of assets under distress. May result in noticeable changes to employer contributions.</p> <p>Examples - Major change in the world economic outlook, or in the present value of future liabilities requiring a change in strategy, or inability to implement a significant Fund launch.</p>	<p>Major failure of administration function, likely to be systematic in nature, of a high-profile nature to members and employers.</p> <p>Example - Widespread and persistent failure to meet key performance indicators such as dealing with certain types of administration query or action within deadlines, and receipt of significant numbers of complaints from members.</p>

		Examples - A significant delay in the issue of member annual benefit statements, or persistently charging an employer an incorrect contribution rate.	
--	--	---	--

Score	Description	Members and Employers	Investments and Funding	Administration
5	Catastrophic	<p>Serious and systematic errors in benefits payments or administration KPI's, or significant volatility or increase in employer contributions.</p> <p>Significant breaches of the law</p> <p>Serious complaints and reputational harm caused</p> <p>Example - Systematic failure to monitor employer contributions resulting in subsequent identification of many contribution deficits that employers cannot then catch up with.</p>	<p>Resulting in significant volatility or increase in employer contributions, inability to pay member benefits, or a need to significantly increase investment risk exposure.</p> <p>Significant failure to meet legal or regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Serious reputational harm caused</p> <p>Example - Catastrophic deterioration in the ability or employers to pay contributions resulting in a need for emergency investment and cashflow measures to keep paying benefits.</p>	<p>Catastrophic failure of administration function leading to inability to pay benefits accurately or at all on a large scale.</p> <p>Significant breaches of the law</p> <p>Serious complaints and reputational harm caused</p> <p>Example - Wholesale failure of the pension payroll function resulting in no member payments being made.</p>



Controls that are currently in place to mitigate risks, together with additional sources of assurance are listed and these are then considered to give a post control impact and likelihood score. Again, these have been combined to give an overall post control risk score which has been assigned a RAG rating.

### **Management and reporting of the Risk Management**

Officers review emerging risks quarterly. These reviews allow current controls to be assessed and analysed to ensure they are still in place and relevant. It also gives the opportunity to identify areas for improvement and additional controls required. New emerging risks are also discussed at these reviews and added into the Risk register.

At the quarterly meetings, Officers drill down into the detailed risks and gain an understanding of the controls in place and the various sources of assurance. Any areas of concern are brought to the attention of the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee at their next meeting.

It is important to recognise that some of the greatest risks faced by the Pension Fund arise from change. The consideration of emerging risks will also form part of the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee's review.

In addition to looking at the risks on the Risk Register, the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee reviews the Fund's risk management process. They will also report on any suggested improvements and areas of concern in the risk management of the Fund.

Risks associated with specific areas of the Fund are discussed as part of relevant Officers regular team meetings. Emerging risks in particular are highlighted as part of this process.

The Administering Authority's Internal Audit Service review the Fund's processes, including Governance, Administration and Investments, considering the associated risks and analysing the controls in place. They give an opinion to Officers of the Fund as to the effectiveness of current controls and advise on any improvements required.

### **Responsibility**

This Risk Management Policy applies to all members of the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee, Staff and Pensions Committee and the Local Pensions Board. It also applies to the designated Director, S151 Officer and all other Officers involved in the management of the Fund.

Advisers to the Fund are expected to be aware of this Policy, and assist the Officers, Committee and Local Board members as required, in meeting the objectives of this Policy.

### **Consultation, Approval and Review**

This Policy was approved by the Pension Fund Investment Sub Committee at their meeting on 8 September 2025. The next review of this policy will be in September 2027.